

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/615,767	07/10/2003	Makoto Shirai	Q76106	9463	
23373 7.	590 06/24/2004		EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			SHEEHAN, JOHN P		
SUITE 800	D VIII III II V DI VOD, I V. W.	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037		1742		
			DATE MAILED, 04/24/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 06/24/2004	

DATE MAILED. 00/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		_						
	Application I	No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/615,767		SHIRAI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
	John P. Shee		1742					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the co	ver sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard period for reply will.	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, I n. a reply within the statutory riod will apply and will ex tatute, cause the applicati	however, may a reply be tim minimum of thirty (30) days pire SIX (6) MONTHS from ion to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.				
Status		•						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	•							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
3) Since this application is in condition for allo								
closed in accordance with the practice und	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consi							
Application Papers								
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	nine r .							
10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2003 is/are:	0)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10 July 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document of the priority document of the priority document of the certified copies of the certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the certified c	nents have been renents have been repriority documents ireau (PCT Rule 1	eceived. eceived in Applicati s have been receive 7.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s)								
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>December 17, 2003</u>. 	3/08) 5)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P Other:		D-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/615,767

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoppin (US Patent No. 2,923,621, cited in the IDS submitted December 17,2003).

Hoppin teaches a nickel brazing alloy comprising:

chromium

10 to 30 wt%

manganese

7 to 15 wt%

silicon

8 to 12 wt% and

nickel

the balance (column 2, lines 49 and 50)

The chromium and manganese contents taught by Hoppin overlap the chromium and manganese content recited in applicants' claim.

The claim and Hoppin differ in that Hoppin teaches a silicon content of 8 to 12 wt % while applicants' claim recites a silicon content of 5 to 7 wt %.

Application/Control Number: 10/615,767

Art Unit: 1742

However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have considered the invention to have been obvious because the claimed silicon content (5 to 7 wt %) and the prior art silicon content (8 to 12 wt %) closely approximate each other, that is the claimed upper limit of 7 % and Hoppin's lower limit of 8 wt % closely approximate each other and therefore the range of the prior art establishes *prima facie* obviousness because one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the similar ranges to have the same properties. *See in re Peterson*, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382, citing *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773, 779 and MPEP 2144.05.

"a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed.Cir.1985)(Court held as proper a rejection of a claim directed to an alloy of "having 0.8%nickel,0.3%molybdenum,up to 0.1%iron,bal - ance titanium" as obvious over a reference disclosing alloys of 0.75%nickel,0.25%molybdenum,balance titanium and 0.94%nickel,0.31%molybdenum,bal - ance titanium.).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Sheehan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (6:45-4:30) Second Monday Off.

Art Unit: 1742

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John P. Sheehan Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

jps